

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(El Dorado)

In re the Marriage of DEENA L. and
ROBERT C. RILEY.

DEENA L. RILEY,

Respondent,

v.

ROBERT C. RILEY,

Appellant.

C085758

(Super. Ct. No. PFL20150498)

Appellant Robert C. Riley appeals from a trial court order dividing the parties' marital estate and ordering support. Appellant raises four contentions on appeal. He contends the trial court erred in calculating child support. He also contends the trial court "erred in finding that the community property was sold with the house," "erred in finding that [respondent Deena L. Riley] did not know about the Best Buy card, and that it was solely [appellant]'s debt," and "erred in eliminating the spousal support [respondent] had been ordered to give to [appellant] each month."

In a challenge to an order of the court, the trial court's order is presumed to be correct and the appellant has the burden to prove otherwise by presenting legal authority and analysis on each point made, supported by appropriate citations to the material facts in the record, else the argument may be deemed forfeited. (*Badie v. Bank of America* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 779, 784-785; *Guthrey v. State of California* (1998) 63 Cal.App.4th 1108, 1115-1116; *Duarte v. Chino Community Hospital* (1999) 72 Cal.App.4th 849, 856.) It is the appellant's responsibility to support claims of error with citation and authority; we are not obligated to perform that function on the appellant's behalf and may treat the contentions as forfeited. (*Lewis v. County of Sacramento* (2001) 93 Cal.App.4th 107, 113; *Badie*, at pp. 784-785.)

These rules of appellate procedure apply to appellant even though he is representing himself on appeal. (*Leslie v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance* (1991) 234 Cal.App.3d 117, 121; see also *Nelson v. Gaunt* (1981) 125 Cal.App.3d 623, 638-639; *Wantuch v. Davis* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 786, 795.) Appellant did not comply with these rules and thus his claims on appeal are forfeited.

DISPOSITION

The orders of the court are affirmed.

_____/s/
HOCH, J.

We concur:

_____/s/
RAYE, P. J.

_____/s/
RENNER, J.